


.....
(Original Signature of Member)

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. _____

To amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to prioritize
programs that provide evidence of performance.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. HOUCIN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the
Committee on _____

A BILL

To amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act
to prioritize programs that provide evidence of performance.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Prioritizing Evidence
5 for Workforce Development Act”.

6 **SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE EVI-**
7 **DENCE OF PERFORMANCE.**

8 Section 102 of the Workforce Innovation and Oppor-
9 tunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3112) is amended—

1 (1) in subsection (b)—

2 (A) in paragraph (1)—

3 (i) in subparagraph (D), by striking
4 “and” after the semicolon;

5 (ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking
6 the period at the end and inserting “;
7 and”; and

8 (iii) by adding at the end the fol-
9 lowing:

10 “(F) a description of how the State plans
11 to prioritize the funding of evidence-based pro-
12 grams for which evidence from a rigorous eval-
13 uation of the programs shows a positive effect
14 on the target population for the programs, with
15 highest priority given to programs that are
16 high-evidence interventions, next priority given
17 to programs that are moderate-evidence inter-
18 ventions, and next priority given to programs
19 that are low-evidence interventions.”; and

20 (B) in paragraph (2)(C)—

21 (i) in clause (vii), by striking “and”
22 after the semicolon;

23 (ii) in clause (viii), by striking the pe-
24 riod at the end and inserting “; and”; and

1 (iii) by adding at the end the fol-
2 lowing:

3 “(ix) how the State will prioritize the
4 funding of evidence-based programs for
5 which evidence from a rigorous evaluation
6 of the programs shows a positive effect on
7 the target population for the programs.”;
8 and

9 (2) by adding at the end the following:

10 “(d) DEFINITIONS.—In subsection (b):

11 “(1) EVIDENCE-BASED.—The term ‘evidence-
12 based’, used with respect to an activity, strategy, or
13 other intervention, means a high-evidence, moderate-
14 evidence, or low-evidence intervention.

15 “(2) HIGH-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘high-evi-
16 dence’, used with respect to an intervention, means
17 an intervention that is shown to produce a sizable,
18 sustained effect on important outcomes, in—

19 “(A) two or more well-conducted experi-
20 mental studies carried out in typical community
21 settings and conducted at different implementa-
22 tion sites; or

23 “(B) one large multisite well-conducted ex-
24 perimental study carried out in such a setting.

1 “(3) LOW-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘low-evidence’,
2 used with respect to an intervention, means an inter-
3 vention that is shown to produce or have the poten-
4 tial to produce a positive effect on important out-
5 comes, in a study based on a reasonable hypothesis
6 and with credible research findings, such as a cor-
7 relational study with statistical controls for selection
8 bias or descriptive research such as a case study.

9 “(4) MODERATE-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘mod-
10 erate-evidence’, used with respect to an intervention,
11 means an intervention that is shown to produce a
12 positive effect, that is sizable but not yet conclusive,
13 on important outcomes, in at least one well-con-
14 ducted experimental study, or in a rigorous quasi-ex-
15 perimental study from which a researcher can draw
16 a causal conclusion regarding the intervention’s ef-
17 fectiveness.

18 “(5) WELL-CONDUCTED EXPERIMENTAL
19 STUDY.—The term ‘well-conducted experimental
20 study’ means an experimental study such as a study
21 with randomized controlled trials.”.